

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 398 448

CE 072 361

AUTHOR Yugar, Yolanda; And Others
TITLE Learn and Serve: Evaluation of the Pennsylvania
1995-96 Learn and Serve America Grant Program.
INSTITUTION Pittsburgh Univ., Pa. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg.
PUB DATE Jun 96
NOTE 65p.; For the 1994-95 report, see ED 391 952.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizenship Education; Comparative Analysis;
Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary
Education; Grants; Integrated Curriculum; Outcomes of
Education; Program Effectiveness; *Public Service;
Records (Forms); School Community Programs; *School
Community Relationship; *Service Learning; *State
Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

The Pennsylvania Department of Education's Learn and Serve America K-12 Grant Program distributes funds from the Corporation for National Service to schools to develop and expand service learning programs throughout Pennsylvania. The 1995-96 grant program is currently funding 101 school-based programs (70 recipients of continuing funds from the previous year, 21 recipients of new full-year minigrants, and 10 half-year grant recipients). The grant program's primary objectives are as follows: foster civic responsibility; enhance the academic curriculum; and promote students' personal growth by using the service learning model of preparation, service, reflection, and celebration. In an evaluation of the 1995-96 grant programs that included site visits to each grant recipient, most programs appeared to have met the program's objectives. Although many programs integrated meaningful community service into the academic program, others did not. Those programs with integrated projects, strong collaborations, and high levels of student participation were generally the most effective; however, nearly every program had a positive and successful program year. (Appendixes constituting approximately two-thirds of this document contain the following: Year 2 objectives and goals; Corporation for National Service Forms; site visit protocol and program profile; and service learning hours by subgrantee.) (MN)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

**Learn and Serve:
Evaluation of the Pennsylvania
1995-96
Learn and Serve America
Grant Program**

Yolanda Yugar, M.Ed.
Jennifer Thomason, B.S.
Carl I. Fertman, Ph.D.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ The document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality

* Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Y Yugar

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Pennsylvania Service Learning Evaluation Network
University of Pittsburgh

June, 1996

The Pennsylvania Service Learning Evaluation Network

The Pennsylvania Service Learning Evaluation Network, based at the University of Pittsburgh, supports service learning programs. The network provides information, support, resources, and guidance. The primary goal of the network is to help schools evaluate their service learning programs.

For more information please contact Carl I. Fertman, Ph.D., director; the Pennsylvania Service Learning Evaluation Network, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, 5D21 Forbes Quadrangle, Pittsburgh, PA, 15260, 412-648-7196, FAX (412) 648-7198 or Yolanda Yugar, M.Ed., project director; Pennsylvania Learn and Service America Grant Program Evaluation, 412-648-1776.

The Pennsylvania Service Learning Evaluation Network is funded by Pennsylvania Department of Education, Office of Community and Student Services; Dale Baker, coordinator; 333 Market Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120, Telephone 717-783-7089.

Acknowledgements

This report reflects the time, energy, and commitment of all the young people, coordinators, teachers, parents, administrators, community agency directors and staff, and others who took time out of their busy schedules throughout the 1995-96 school year to share their thoughts, experiences, and future plans for service learning. Thank you. Your support is invaluable.

We would like to offer a special thanks to the coordinators. They are: David Aboud, Dr. Betsy Adams, Jane Adams, Shirley Franklin-Archie, Lyle Augustine, Deirdre Baljo, Jeres Baranowski, Barbara Barba, Patricia Berger, Mary Bolenbaugh, Nancy Bogart, Helen Belsak, Bev Bonkoski, Jennifer Bowen-Frantz, Marilyn Brown, James Breslin, Marlene Brubaker, Lois Bruckno, Jill Campbell, Denys Candy, Florence Chapman, Dr. B. Chatterjee, Frank Cetera, Lucille Christini, Mark Clevenger, Mary Beth Crago, Mark Crosson, Mary Cutillo, Kim Daly, Jerry Darlington, Pam Delaney, Kathleen DeSante, Curtis Dietrich, Dominic DeFilippo, Joe Emrick, Carlene Etele, Joe Findlay, Ruth Fisher, Michelle Frank, Diane Galaton, Dawn Germano, Charles Gill, Jack Giran, Vickie Goffredo, Kathy Good, Don Goodwin, Cliff Goodrow, Augie Grant, Toby Greco, Patrick Gribbin, Marsha Grode, Alan Guandolo, Audrey F. Harvey, Peg DeNaples-Hiler, Robert Hoeppel, Kathleen Hood, Kitty Hricehank, Ella Jeffrey, Brent Johnson, Roberta DeProspero Johnston, Suzanne Kallish, Cheryl Kaufman, Chris Keener, Emily Kirkland, Karen Klemash, John Lafferty, Melissa Latini, Claudette Levett, D. Jennette Lewis, Diana LoPinto, Patricia Loughran, Carol Lucas, Joanne Maguire, Ronnie Manlin, Tom Marcinko, Brenda Mader, Kimberly McCann, Mary McCloskey, Angie McDonough, Jennifer McNellie, Joan Mellon, Sally Metz, Jean Miller, Sue Miller, Adrienne Minassian, John Murray, Nancy Nazadi, Susan Newman, Alan Ozer, Joe Paradise, Judy Panebianco, Dr. Patricia Pollifrong, Jan Quailey, Gina Rakos, Susan Rothamel, Jeff Singleton, Nabeedah Shakir, David Sikorski, John Skief, Diane Smith, Mike Smith, Jill Salmon, Benita Solomn, Eileen Stephey, Bernadette Strong, Vonnie Teagarten, Yvonne Tilghman, Mike Vranesevic, Phyllis Walsh, Annette Williams, and Kelly Yettters.

We would like to recognize staff members of the Pennsylvania Department of Education for their ongoing support and dedication. To Jim Buckheit, Dale Baker, and Ruth Burke: thank you.

Thanks also to Deirdre Baljo, Rosline Chavis, Landi Hoover, Beth Margolis-Rupp, Jeffrey Singleton, Richard Subers, Lou White, and Annette Williams for help and cooperation in conducting site visits.

Thanks to Joanne Long for moral support and technical assistance, and to Lisa McClendon for assistance throughout the evaluation process.

Finally, we are grateful to the young people and adults who are out in their communities performing service. They make our schools, communities, and families stronger through their service learning experiences.

Executive Summary

The Pennsylvania Department of Education Learn and Serve America K-12 Grant Program provides funds to schools to develop and expand their service learning programs throughout Pennsylvania. These funds are allotted to the Department of Education through the Corporation for National Service. The 1995-96 Grant Program presently funds 101 school-based programs. Of these 101 programs, 70 were given continuing funds from the previous year, 21 new mini-grants were awarded to programs for the full 1995-96 school year, and 10 half-year program grants were added in January of 1996.

Service learning is the integration of meaningful community service into the academic curriculum. This integration has taken place in many of the programs funded by the Learn and Serve Grant, and even those programs that did not accomplish higher-level integration made noticeable progress toward that goal. The purpose of the Grant Program is to foster civic responsibility, enhance the academic curriculum of the students, and promote their personal growth by using the service learning model of preparation, service, reflection, and celebration. The individual programs funded by the grant showed definite signs of having met these objectives.

The three main sections in this final report are on Service Learning Programming, Collaboration, and Student Participation in the Decision-Making Process. There were two distinct types of programs among the subgrantees -- those that were integrated and those that were not. The section on programming discusses various aspects of these two groups. The section on collaboration presents information gleaned from coordinators about the challenges that can face a program in their collaborative relationships, and what can be done to initiate, support, and strengthen those partnerships. The final section, on student participation, describes the various levels of participation that can exist within a service learning program, and pinpoints the trends that can be seen in each level.

Although those programs with integrated projects, strong collaborations, and high levels of student participation were generally the most effective service learning programs, almost every subgrantee had a positive and successful year. Coordinators were asked in their final annual reports for the Pennsylvania Department of Education to rate their programs on the amount of impact they had on their school and community. They overwhelmingly rated themselves as above average, and the results of this final evaluation strongly support their self-assessment.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	1
Subgrantee Information	2
Participant Information	3
II. Service Learning Programming	3
Service Learning and the Continuum of Service Integration	4
Kinds of Services Provided	8
III. Collaboration	9
Initiating a Collaborative Relationship	9
Supporting and Strengthening a Collaboration	10
Challenges That Face a Collaboration	11
IV. Student Participation in the Decision-Making Process	13
No Participation	14
Little Participation	14
Some Participation	15
A Great Deal of Participation	16
V. Conclusion	17
Appendix A: Year Two Objectives and Progress	19
Appendix B: Corporation for National Service Forms	21
Appendix C: Site Visit Protocol & Program Profile	32
Appendix D: Service Learning Hours by Subgrantee	52

List of Tables

Table 1:	Grants by Type	2
Table 2:	Grant Distribution by Region	2
Table 3:	Grant Distribution by Area	2
Table 4:	Grant Focus	2
Table 5:	Participants' Gender	3
Table 6:	Participants' Race	3
Table 7:	Participants' Grade Level	3
Table 8:	Breakdown of Learning Hours	4
Table 9:	Continuum of Service Integration	5
Table 10:	Number of Projects at Each Level of the Service Integration Continuum	6
Table 11:	Priority Area Addressed by Each Subgrantee	8
Table 12:	Percentage of Service Hours in Each Priority Area	8

Introduction

Service learning is the integration of meaningful community service into the academic curriculum. To support service learning throughout Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Department of Education Learn and Serve America K-12 Grant Program provides funds to schools to develop or expand their service learning programs. These funds are allotted to the Department of Education through the Corporation for National Service, which was established as a result of The National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993. By providing this support, the Learn and Serve Grant Program hopes to foster civic responsibility, enhance the academic curriculum of the students, and promote their personal growth by using the service learning model of preparation, service, reflection, and celebration.

Service learning is flourishing in this second year of the three-year Learn and Serve grant. During the year, the objectives of the Learn and Serve Grant Program have not only been met, but greatly surpassed (a table of the year's objectives and the progress made regarding them is located in Appendix A). This surge in the success of service learning can be attributed to two major causes. First, 70 of the subgrantees continued to run well-established programs; some have been in existence for as much as five years or longer, and their productivity endures. Even the new subgrantees, for the most part, used previous planning grants to formulate a reasonable plan of action that would launch their programs into a strong first year.

The second resource that contributed to a successful year was the program coordinators. There has been little change in coordinators during the existence of service learning in Pennsylvania. Their steady leadership has enabled programs to strengthen and expand, and has aided in both reinforcing old collaborations and forming new ones. Coordinators have garnered the administrative support that ultimately promotes the development and growth of service learning programming throughout a district.

This final report highlights the successes and contributions of the 101 subgrantees in their quest to build strong, healthy, and self-sustaining service learning programs. All data, both qualitative and quantitative, included in this final evaluation report was collected from the subgrantee coordinators through evaluation techniques designed to measure program implementation and growth in accordance with the objectives and goals of this second year. The evaluation forms include an Individual Program Profile and two Corporation for National Service forms, one for the beginning of the year and one for the end of the year (copies of these forms can be found in Appendix B). The 21 new full-year grantees received site visits as part of their evaluation process (site visit protocol and forms are located in Appendix C).

During the evaluation, some very distinct themes emerged from the information provided by each coordinator in respect to service learning. This report discusses these themes, painting an accurate picture of service learning in Pennsylvania. Demographic subgrantee information, participant information, and pieces that

elaborate on the subjects of service learning programming, collaboration, and student participation in the decision-making process are included in the report. In addition to these sections, the report's conclusion gives a summary of the information it contains and suggests possible strategies for future program development.

Subgrantee Information

The 1995-96 Pennsylvania Learn and Serve America K-12 Grant Program presently funds 101 school-based programs to assist in meeting the Commonwealth's mission to make citizen service "the common expectation and experience for all Pennsylvanians."

Of the 101 school-based programs, 70 were given continuing funds from the previous year. Nine of these were disseminator grants of \$25,000 and 61 were mini-grants of \$7,500. During the 1995-96 school year, there were also 21 new mini-grants of \$7,500 awarded to programs for the full year, and 10 program grants of \$3,750 were added in January of 1996. The following tables offer general demographic information about the subgrantees.

Table 1: Grants by Type

TYPE OF GRANT	#	%
Mini-Grants	82	81%
Disseminator Grants	9	9%
Program Grants	10	10%

Table 2: Grant Distribution by Region

REGION	#	%
Central PA	17	17%
Eastern PA	53	52%
Western PA	31	31%

Table 3: Grant Distribution by Area

TYPE OF AREA	#	%
Rural	35	34%
Suburban	32	32%
Urban	32	32%
Mixed	2	2%

Table 4: Grant Focus

TYPE OF SITE	#	%
Elementary School Focus	9	9%
Middle/Junior School Focus	8	8%
High School Focus	37	37%
Across School Level Focus	45	44%
Out of School Youth	2	2%

Participant Information

This year 51,437 participants made 1995-96 the most successful service learning year yet. The student participants represent a diverse gathering of different genders, races, and grades. The tables below offer demographic information about the participants.

Table 5: Participant's Gender

GENDER	%
Male	45%
Female	55%

Table 6: Participant's Race

RACE	%
Caucasian	80%
African American	13%
Hispanic/Latino	2%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2%
Native American/ Alaskan Native	.0005%
Multi-racial	.005%
Other	3%

Table 7: Participant's Grade level

GRADE LEVEL	%
K-5th grade	27%
6th grade	6%
7th & 8th grade	21%
9th - 12th grade	43%
Out of school youth	3%

Service Learning Programming

Service learning is thriving in Pennsylvania. During the 1995-96 school year, 51,437 participants provided 1,051,588 hours of service to 143,187 recipients, compared to 36,934 participants who provided 716,007 hours of service to 535,058 recipients during the 1994-95 school year. It is, however, important to note that only 43% of coordinators reported the number of people receiving services this year.

Coordinators were often not able to determine the number of recipients, due to the fact that in many cases entire communities received services, and calculating these kinds of numbers would be "next to impossible." These numbers show an encouraging increase in service activity, and the growth does not stop there. Non-participant volunteers, both adults and students recruited by participants when needed, contributed their time and energy to service learning programs during the past year. With their 124,385 hours of service, the total service hours rise to 1,175,973.

Additionally, participants logged a total of 535,654 learning hours. This is a decrease of 67,003 hours from last year. This is not necessarily an indication that less time is being spent on learning, however; as integration increases, it becomes more difficult to calculate learning hours. A breakdown of learning hours is listed in the table below (service learning hours performed by each subgrantee can be found in Appendix D).

Table 8: Breakdown of Learning Hours

LEARNING AREA	%
Coursework	48%
Reflection	16%
Training	10%
Other Activities	11%

The largest percentage of service recipients were students who received tutoring, mentoring, and support services as part of school success programs or school readiness activities. Senior citizens were the second largest group to benefit from student service. Community individuals, negatively impacted by poverty or poor health, were the third largest group; they most often received services via homeless shelters, community health outreach programs, and public safety initiatives.

Two distinct groups with differing types of programming emerged during the 1995-96 evaluation. The first group, consisting of 89 subgrantees, integrated their service learning projects into the academic curriculum. Fewer projects were implemented by school organizations or clubs, in community service/service learning courses, for extra credit, or by special events; these types of projects have more to do with what has traditionally been referred to as community service or volunteerism than with service learning.

The second group, the majority of the projects were in the category of community service or volunteerism, and integrated projects were seen less frequently. Individual students selected their own service projects and sites. This type of programming was most often reported as a part of service organizations or clubs, elective credit, community service learning courses, school-wide projects, or graduation service requirements. Twelve subgrantees reported this type of service learning as part of their service learning programs. With community service-oriented programming, as many as 2000 students may provide services to over 500 community agencies in a given program. These two separate groups, those with community service-oriented programs and those with integrated service learning, reflected very different programming results.

Service Learning and the Continuum of Service Integration

As part of the three-year grant requirement, subgrantees are expected to move up the continuum by at least two levels during the three-year grant cycle. Although this growth may sound easy in theory, in practice it can be quite complex. One

reason why advancement can be difficult is that coordinators can't pinpoint where they *currently* exist on the continuum, much less where they need to go to satisfy the grant requirement. A table showing the continuum of service integration is located below.

Table 9. Continuum of Service Integration

School Club/ Organization	Extra Credit	Special Event	Community Service Class	Outgrowth of existing Curriculum	Coordinating Disciplinary Theme	School Wide
< < Lower integration ----- Higher integration > >						

During the 1994-95 evaluation year, coordinators were asked to identify where their programs existed on the service learning continuum. What we discovered was that the programs cannot easily be assigned to one location on the continuum. Schools often have several different service learning projects that each exist on a different level of the continuum, thus making it very difficult to identify one point where the program itself exists. What was also revealed in that earlier evaluation is that projects will often move from one level to another without going through each level; it is not necessary to move through each level to attain curriculum integration. Advancement from level 1 to level 5, for instance, seems to happen rather easily and is the most common type of progression within the continuum. Thus, a level 1 project through a school club or organization may become integrated into the academic curriculum without first becoming an extra credit or special event project and without having a service learning course in place.

Based on this information, for the 1995-96 evaluation coordinators were asked to list each of their program's projects and identify where each project is on the continuum. However, this request revealed the fact that both continuum advancement and service learning itself are becoming more complex. Not only were different projects within the same program on different levels, as discovered last year, but often one project was operating on various levels simultaneously. These findings indicate two different things; the first is that coordinators are becoming more creative in the way their projects are planned. They are not limiting themselves to traditional types of projects, but instead are really thinking about the specific needs of their students and their programs, and then customizing projects to fit those needs. The second indication is that the continuum is becoming less effective as a way of measuring a program's advancement. As service learning becomes more complex, a less rigid way of evaluating and categorizing programs is needed.

This is all too plain, given the fact that over 50% of coordinators reported projects that currently exist on 3 or more levels of the continuum at once. To show how this is possible, we will use an "Adopt-a-highway" project as an example. A Key Club may choose to participate as one of their service projects (level 1); other students

may become involved for extra credit (level 2); the project could be included as part of Earth Day activities (level 3); it could be initiated, planned, and sponsored through a community service/service learning course (level 4); it could be used as part of an environmental unit either in one subject area (level 5) or across disciplines (level 6); and finally, it could be school-wide, open either to all science classes or to all students in the school (level 7). The most common multiple-level scenario appeared to include participation at levels one, three, and five; however, other combinations of levels were also reported.

During the 1995-96 evaluation, coordinators reported 959 projects. They listed anywhere from 1 to 91 projects for their school, with an average of 11 projects per subgrantee. These numbers do not include a large number of different projects undertaken by students in the schools where primarily community service is performed; this refers almost exclusively to the 12 schools mentioned earlier, who reported programs that were mostly limited to non-integrated projects. In these cases, the projects completed by students were numerous, and as a result were under-documented. Most coordinators did not cite each individual project, and even where some concrete data was available, we felt that these numbers, if included, would make the calculations for programming as a whole inaccurate. Since the majority of the schools (the other 89) had much different results, preserving this data was seen as the priority. Therefore, the table below shows a breakdown of the levels on which these 959 projects exist. The table also reflects the fact that many of the projects exist on more than one level at a time.

Table 10: Number of Projects at Each Level of the Service Integration Continuum

LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 4	LEVEL 5	LEVEL 6	LEVEL 7
210	50	238	120	433	132	153

A few distinct patterns emerge from this data. First of all, it is clear that a greater number of projects are becoming integrated. It is also the case that more projects are occurring at level 5 (as an outgrowth of the existing curriculum) than at any other level. This is a direct result of so many projects jumping straight from level one to level 5. Over 80% of all coordinators reported at least one project at level five, and 50% of coordinators reported at least one project at level six. The biggest reason for this progress is the growing number of teachers involved in service learning. The number of teachers who use service learning in their classrooms has expanded from 1,167 to 2,072. This increase is most likely due the success of service learning during previous years and the hard work of coordinators who strive to promote service learning as a teaching methodology. The enthusiasm of students and the support of the administration has also had an impact on this higher level of integration.

Another strong pattern emerged in relation to non-integrated service learning. Non-integrated projects conducted as part of a community service/service learning course, or as required service hours, may actually hinder service learning integration. A trend indicates that subgrantees who have a community service/service learning course or who require service for graduation are less likely

to have service learning integrated by teachers in other academic areas. Although the students who are enrolled in the community service/service learning courses or who are required to perform service for graduation usually have more say in the selection, planning, and decision-making for their service projects than those involved in more integrated projects, service in these cases is seldom integrated into the academic curriculum, and therefore is not viewed as a teaching methodology.

There is, however, a more positive side to non-integrated service learning. Students who participate in community service/service learning courses have the opportunity to experience the service learning model of preparation, service, reflection, and celebration. This model is not always as well-developed in activities where the service is integrated. Also, since students usually have more leeway to make their own choices with non-integrated types of projects, they often choose to use their service hours to explore areas of personal and career interest, and therefore are indirectly tying their service to academia under their own initiative.

There were further discoveries made during this year's evaluation. One was that projects reported as level 7 (those integrated throughout the school) were not necessarily *integrated* across grades and curricula; most often they were, instead, non-integrated projects that were simply open to the entire school if students chose to participate. These were usually part of a special event, a club activity, or required hours of service. Projects of this sort are valuable, but should not be described as level 7 undertakings.

We also found that it can be difficult to accurately document credit for service learning. There are a number of ways that students may receive credit: as part of an integrated curriculum, for an elective course, for a community service class, or as a graduation requirement. Although over 95% of subgrantees have some degree of integrated service or offer some type of credit for service, it appears that each of these areas is not being consistently recorded and reported. We know that credit is being given, but data collection for this specific element of service learning has proven to be inconsistent.

The last finding is related to one that emerged during the 1994-95 evaluation. It became evident last year that service learning is different at different educational levels: elementary school, middle school, and high school. Elementary programs are generally more integrated, high schools tend to have more service through organizations and clubs or service learning courses, and middle schools are somewhere between the two. This difference is evident from the data collected during the past year as well, but the boundaries are now less clearly defined. The most noticeable change is that cross-discipline projects (level 6) are becoming more numerous, especially at the middle and high school levels. This appears to be the result of positive experiences with activities on the lower levels of the service learning continuum. Having had success with these lower-level projects, teachers and students alike have increased enthusiasm and confidence with which to tackle more ambitious undertakings. Teachers in other academic areas are also more

willing to become involved when they witness a program's success. Thus, even a service learning program that starts on a modest scale can soon expand, building on the momentum from successes both large and small.

Kinds of Services Provided

This section highlights the types of service learning that exist throughout Pennsylvania. What is notable is that the services provided meet both the federal and state priorities addressed in the subgrantees' grant proposal. The grant requires that at least one of the federal (education, environment, public safety, or human needs) and one of the state (public safety or human needs) priorities be addressed.

Service learning programs in education address areas of school readiness and school success and most often emphasize tutoring, mentoring, and conflict resolution. Human needs programs address areas of health and home and often involve service provided to senior citizens, hospitals, nursing facilities, homeless shelters, and Habitat for Humanity projects. Public safety concerns issues of crime prevention and crime control and often results in collaborations with police programs that fingerprint and photograph children for their protection, or with programs like D.A.R.E. Environmental programs involve beautification projects, recycling and clean-up efforts, and restoration of public and historical landmarks. Most subgrantees participate in more than one of these priority areas, as can be seen in Table 11. In fact, although subgrantees list some of their projects as "other," under close observation it is usually the case that the project listed can be placed in one of the priority areas.

The two tables below show the number and type of state and federal priorities that are being met by subgrantees. Table 11 gives the priority areas addressed by each subgrantee, and Table 12 shows the percentage of hours contributed to each priority area.

Table 11: Priority Areas Addressed by Each Subgrantee

PRIORITY	#	%
Education	95	94%
Human Needs	88	87%
Environment	78	77%
Safety	47	46%
Other	47	46%

Table 12: Percentage of Service Hours in Each Priority Area

PRIORITY	%
Education	37%
Human Needs	36%
Environment	14%
Safety	33%
Other	8%

Collaboration

Collaborations are the life-blood of service learning. Without strong collaborations, a service learning program cannot grow, strengthen, or sustain itself; it will have trouble providing its student participants with meaningful service activities, and will experience more obstacles when seeking funding and other resources. Much has been learned about initiating, strengthening, and supporting collaborations between schools and community agencies over the last two years. During the 1995-96 school year, 101 subgrantees collaborated with 1,796 community agencies. Agency collaborations for the programs ranged from 0 to 500, with an average of 8 collaborations per subgrantee (a median was used to calculate this average, due to the fact that 11 subgrantees had more than 20 collaborations, and 2 had over 100).

The sections below give an overview of information provided by coordinators on evaluation forms. The information was taken from comments they made about initiating, supporting, and strengthening partnerships, and from their observations on the challenges that can face a collaboration. The data clearly shows that the basic essentials to a successful collaborative relationship are communication, time, and an advisory board that includes representatives from each group that plays a part in the partnership: teachers, administrators, parents, students, and community agency staff.

Initiating A Collaborative Relationship

Collaboration between a school and a community agency can be initiated in a number of ways. Programs most frequently reported that partnerships were begun when a teacher or program coordinator contacted an agency by one means or another: usually by phone, letter, or personal contact. Some found this last method to be the most effective. Community agencies seem to respond with more enthusiasm when they have met and spoken face-to-face with someone from the program. Often a teacher, school administrator, or school staff member is already a member of a community agency, and a partnership is formed through that contact. If such connections do not already exist, they can be established by attending seminars or workshops at a local university, community college, or community agency. Within such settings, excellent ties can be formed that may eventually lead to a strong partnership.

The students themselves can also be the impetus behind the formation of a partnership. Sometimes students request a site and then leave the task of actually contacting the agency to a teacher or coordinator. Occasionally, however, the students will set up a meeting between representatives of the student body and members of the community agency staff on their own. Initial contact can be made through a student's parent as well. Chances are that within the student body there are kids who have parents who either work for a local community agency or who have friends who do. Many successful collaborations have begun through this type of connection.

The third way that collaboration can begin is for a community agency to contact a school's program and suggest that they work together. When this happens, it is usually because the agency has heard positive things about the program; it has gained recognition and credibility in the area. Many programs reported that public awareness of their group was beneficial. The two main ways in which this awareness was effective was in gaining resources (funding and project materials) and in forming partnerships in the community. Participants can ensure that their programs are visible and vocal in a community by distributing newsletters, brochures, and flyers that publicize the program and give people an idea of what they are all about, and by being mentioned in local newspapers or television shows. If an agency has heard good things about a program, they will be more likely to enter into a partnership when they are approached with such a request. They may even try to establish contact themselves.

Supporting and Strengthening a Collaboration

A school program and its community agency partner(s) must put effort into supporting and strengthening their collaborative relationship. Like any relationship between two groups or even two individuals, the single most important factor in nurturing a bond is communication, and this was reflected in the reports received from almost all schools. Clear communication is essential both at the beginning of a collaborative relationship and throughout its existence. Before any activity planning takes place, both partners must have a distinct view of each others' goals, intentions, and expectations regarding the collaboration. As time passes, they should be careful to stay in frequent contact. Writing and talking on the phone is of course the quickest and easiest way to stay abreast on a day-to-day basis, but occasionally participating in meetings and workshops is also vital to the success of a collaboration.

Many programs reported that an advisory board with representatives from both the school and the community agency can be greatly beneficial to a collaboration. Board members act as liaisons between their groups, establishing guidelines for the collaboration, ensuring that those guidelines are being met, discussing problems as they arise, and finding solutions for those problems. If either partner has issues that are not addressed, those issues can end up turning into conflict that dissolves the partnership. Board meetings provide a forum where such issues can be raised and dealt with before they threaten a partnership. Advisory boards meet on a regular basis to discuss the students' work and to find out what can be done to improve both the program and the partnership itself.

From the very beginning, both partners should make sure that the activities performed through the collaboration are mutually beneficial. For the schools, this means training the students prior to performing the service activity. Such training may include instruction on how to complete certain tasks, activities geared towards building certain skills, or education on the history and mission of the agency the kids will be working for. Within the group of students there should be strong

student leadership and high levels of responsibility and dedication. Some programs reported that they found the rewards to be great when they put time and energy into placing students at sites or in tasks that matched their individual career interests. These measures will ensure that the students are a help at the sites rather than a hindrance.

For the community agencies, ensuring that activities are mutually beneficial involves treating the students as a valued resource. The agency should make an effort to provide the kids who volunteer their time and energy with meaningful activities rather than menial tasks or busy-work. An agency, like a school, should also take time to learn the goals, policies, and procedures of a school with which they are partnered. Such knowledge promotes mutual respect between collaborators, making for a healthier and hopefully a long-lasting relationship.

A collaboration is also made stronger when both sides make an effort to be flexible. If the agency would like kids to be present for a special one-day event over and above their usual schedule with that agency, the school should try to accommodate those needs. Likewise, students should be able to call the agency to seek further assignments and know that their request will not only be taken seriously, but will be welcomed by agency staff. Being flexible is a way of displaying sensitivity to a partner's needs, showing that the collaboration is highly valued, which in turn strengthens that collaboration.

Collaborators can support their partnership by planning celebrations where the contributions of both sides are officially recognized. Recognition reinforces the value of the work of all participants, thus reinforcing the value of the partnership itself. These celebrations also help to build bridges between the partners, since having all participants meet in a social situation gives individuals a chance to form personal connections with other participants. Keeping a written, pictorial, or video record of the collaboration is another way of recognizing its value and impact. There are a number of ways that collaborators can support and strengthen their collaboration, each of which begins with mutual respect.

Challenges That Face a Collaboration

Various obstacles can either prevent collaborations from being formed, or can hamper their growth once they are established. These obstacles can range from the everyday challenges of running a program (finding funding and materials to make collaborative activities possible) to more far-reaching difficulties that can, in some cases, destroy a collaborative effort.

One such example is that of changes within the staff of the community agency or the program itself. Sometimes there are only a few key contacts who keep a collaboration going, and if these people leave the entire partnership can dissolve. One way to prevent this discouraging situation is to make sure that a number of adults from each partner are acquainted with each other and are involved in

organizing collaborative events and activities. This hearkens back to the previous section, since the best way to prevent a partnership from falling apart when there are staff changes is for there to be frequent and clear communication between not just two, but many of the participants.

Time management can be another challenge. It can be difficult to coordinate students' and community agencies' schedules, since school programs and community agencies operate on very different time tables. This can make it hard to organize agency services within the structure of a school. The best advice for this problem is to plan carefully ahead of time, organizing all events with as much precision as possible, leaving time to smooth over any unexpected contingencies.

Competition can also make it difficult to schedule activities and events within an agency. The competition can come from outside the program, since often such agencies are partnered with a number of schools, or it can come from within. Sometimes it is the case that a single program has too many students for the tasks that are available within the community agency. Some programs reported that they were able to solve this problem by forming more partnerships within the community, and even looking beyond the local community to find agencies that are farther away.

However, forming a collaboration with an agency located at a distance can also be tricky, since some programs in rural schools reported that it is difficult to find agencies that are willing to form a collaboration. They will sometimes be more reluctant to enter into a partnership with a school that is far away, one reason being that it is even harder to coordinate schedules when students must be transported over a long distance just to reach a service site. This raises another issue as well, since once a long-distance partnership is formed, transportation can become an issue. Not only can the task of arranging transportation be difficult, but there can also be legal issues involved with transporting students away from school.

Legalities can also be problematic when students work at service sites. Coordinators often have to procure special permission and insurance, and take extra precautionary measures while at the service sites. In these cases parents often have many concerns, and addressing them can require much time and attention. The best way to make sure that activities run smoothly is to take care of legal issues as far in advance of the scheduled day of the event as possible.

Another challenge that was clear from the reports received is that collaborations are usually much more difficult for new subgrantees. Schools that are new to service learning haven't had a chance to gain recognition in the community, so agencies are more wary of entering into a partnership with them. One encouraging sign for young programs, however, is that older programs reported that forming collaborative relationships becomes much easier with time. Once a couple of partnerships are established and students begin to prove themselves to be hard workers, problem solvers, and responsible, dedicated, and conscientious human

beings, agencies will begin to seek the program's help rather than the other way around.

Programs can also have more trouble finding willing partner organizations when their program has younger students as participants. Younger kids require more supervision and guidance, and are less able to take on responsibility in the tasks they are assigned. The younger the students are, the harder it will be for the staff at community agencies to understand how the kids can be a help. Here again, the best way to disprove this notion is to ensure that the program participants become visible in the community. If they are seen around town performing beneficial services for the community, agency staff will be quicker to recognize their value as workers.

One obstacle that cannot be controlled is the weather. Snow can make it impossible to travel, canceling meetings and scheduled activities both, and rain can ruin outdoor activities or celebrations. More strenuous natural phenomena like flooding can destroy entire projects, wiping out a creek restoration or washing away a nature trail site. The best a program can do in these unfortunate situations is to use them to improve problem-solving and reorganization skills. With a little imagination and a lot of patience, failed projects can turn into valuable learning experiences.

Student Participation in the Decision-Making Process

The level of student decision-making in a program is sometimes a controversial issue among both service learning coordinators and school administrators alike. How much student participation is appropriate? Where is the line drawn between what students can decide and what adults need to determine themselves? Many believe that students don't have the skills necessary to take on such responsibility, while others believe that a program gains its vitality from a strong student voice. What we found during the the 1995-96 evaluation was that the answer to these questions depends on many conditions.

Student participation has been separated into four basic categories: "no participation" describes programs where adults choose and plan all program activities; with "little participation" students have a say in the types of activities they will undertake, but do not choose the service sites or help to shape the program's policies and procedures; "some participation" means that students select both the service projects and the sites where they will take place, but still do not shape program policies and procedures; and finally, with "a great deal of participation" students choose the activities, decide on the sites where they will be carried out, and make decisions regarding their program's policies and procedures, most often as members of the advisory board. The majority of student participation for the 101 subgrantees falls into the category of "some participation."

Certain trends become evident when looking at student participation; the main ones deal with differences in the level of student participation depending on the age of the students, the longevity of the program, and the type of programming involved. Generally speaking, elementary students have the least participation in the decision-making process, especially in the earlier grades of elementary school. Also, the longer a program has been around, the more its students will be given a voice in its operation; this is not only apparent in the current practices of older programs, but also in the future plans of new ones. Finally, students tend to have the most leeway to make choices about projects and sites in those programs where the service is not integrated. In these cases, however, students rarely have a hand in shaping the program itself.

No Participation

When we say that students have "no participation" in the decision-making process, it means exactly that. Adults choose and plan all program activities, and then the students are told what they are expected to do and how they should do it. The students merely carry out the tasks assigned to them. There are not many programs categorized as having no student participation, and those that are tend to be in the first stages of implementation. These programs are still trying to plot their future, with the teachers and administrators involved working hard just to accustom themselves to the rigors of recruiting students, finding resources, and planning and implementing activities. Since the adults themselves were unsure of the program's direction, they found that the added layer of student participation at this stage would make productivity impossible. This was the main reason given for the lack of student involvement.

The programs did report, however, that they mean to increase student participation in the decision-making process as their programs evolve, and are currently trying to determine how best to accomplish this goal. As it is, they encourage students to offer feedback on the program's various components. This input is then taken into account when the teachers make choices about future activities, projects, and program policies. As they move into the second or third year of implementation, the programs hope to provide more opportunities for students to make decisions.

Little Participation

The students involved in the programs categorized as having little participation make decisions that affect some aspects of their programs. They are not involved in the initial planning stages and have no impact on the development of their program's structure or policies -- nor do they choose the sites where project activities will take place. However, in the worst case they make some choices on their own once the service activity and site are fixed, and in the best case they help to choose the activities themselves.

Some of the programs categorized as having little participation are, like the ones that allow no student participation, in the beginning stages of implementation. Again, these new programs say that it is easiest for the adults involved to make the majority of the decisions themselves while they are learning the details and methods of implementing a service learning program. They try to allow students to contribute wherever possible, however, and hope to increase that contribution in the future. These programs also encourage general student feedback, and although the students are not included in the initial planning stages or consulted regarding major decisions, as stated above, the programs report that students are allowed to choose some activities and that smaller decisions within the teacher-initiated activities are left up to the students. Both of these factors show an interest in generating an environment that is more open to student involvement.

A couple of programs already show signs of attempting to increase student input. They have formed student committees or advisory boards, providing a forum for kids to discuss aspects of the program and to air their views on both its present and its future. Although these groups have very little power in the programs at present, they are in some cases given specialized responsibilities, and in each one they at least have the potential to gain a stronger voice in time.

Some Participation

In the programs with some student participation, the students are given more responsibility. They help choose not only the service activities that the program will undertake, but also the sites where those activities will take place. Within the activities themselves they are given greater freedom as well, and become essential components of the decision-making process.

As with the previous categories, the programs that fall into the category of "some participation" hope to give students even more opportunities to make decisions in the future. It is their intention that as the programs evolve, students will not only be encouraged to help develop projects, but will be expected to initiate their own plans and put them into action. And indeed, what some adults found is that once they allow students a certain amount of leeway to make their own choices, the students take care of this objective themselves. As they become more aware of and involved in service learning, they begin to seek more responsibility on their own. For instance, one coordinator reported that the students had begun to take the initiative in expanding the program by encouraging more teachers to incorporate service learning into their curricula.

However, the number of opportunities for decision-making that a program can offer kids may depend on the age of the students involved. In a high school, the students might be able to choose the projects, materials, and service sites; make decisions about the program's priorities; address problems as they arise; and plan the program's celebrations. In an elementary school, on the other hand, the students are much younger and tend to need more guidance. Student participation in the

decision-making process will look much different at this level. Elementary school coordinators reported that their younger kids aren't ready yet to take on responsibility during the earlier stages of implementation. Although activities are generated from student ideas during group discussions or through written assignments, those ideas are refined and made possible through the guidance of adult participants.

A couple of the coordinators reported that even their high school kids were not responsible or experienced enough to run successful projects on their own. One said that although this is true, it is also the case that the adults involved haven't taken the time to help the kids learn to take on that burden. This same source insightfully noted that since the adults are under such pressure to have the program succeed, they don't allow the students the opportunity to fail and then learn from that valuable experience. In concentrating on the program itself, it is easy to lose sight of the most important goal: to provide students with opportunities to learn, to grow, and to acquire necessary skills that will aid them throughout their lives.

Another coordinator with a similar view reported that their students need "a lot of direction and supervision when organizing activities." In an attempt to rectify this situation, the program plans to involve students in decision-making and leadership workshops that will improve their organizational and communication skills. Both of these examples not only show an awareness of a weakness that currently exists in a program, but also a strong inclination to make changes that will build student participation in the decision-making process.

A Great Deal of Participation

In the programs categorized as having a great deal of student participation, the duties that the students are responsible for are both numerous and varied. Projects are planned, developed, and implemented through student collaboration, and the students choose both the services to be performed and the service sites. They identify needs within the community or community agency, decide which issues are most important to them, and then plan projects that will fulfill those needs. They are in charge of recruiting classmates when more participants are needed, they organize periods of reflection and celebration, and they are responsible for publicizing and preparing press releases for projects when needed. They are also involved in program evaluation; they assess strengths and weaknesses and decide on changes that must be made. Student councils, committees, and boards are more numerous and have a stronger voice in the schools, and there are student representatives on the adult advisory boards as well. At this level, the students have a real say in policies and procedures, and they are highly instrumental in shaping a program's growth.

Students may receive training prior to taking on such responsibility within a program. This training may be incorporated as the "learning" part of service learning, or it could be a more intensive training session that takes place at a

project's onset. Coordinators reported training in the areas of self-awareness, leadership skills, team skills, peer mediation, and education on service learning in the community. Students may also receive training before acting as tutors, role models, or baby-sitters for younger kids in projects that require such activities.

The real difference in the programs with a great deal of student participation is that they are student-driven. It is the younger people's energy, vision, and hard work that shape a program's projects and put them into motion. Adults participate as well, but act more as resources than directors. Adults are there when needed to provide guidance and support, but the true force behind a program is the kids, and for this reason it may be difficult to have this level of participation in some types of projects and at some grade levels. Younger students, for instance, will usually not be ready to take on this amount of responsibility, but any experience they do gain as participators will prepare them to have a stronger voice as they grow older.

Because the work the students do is more varied and extensive than that of the adults in programs with a great deal of participation, many schools found it easier to describe the role of adult participants. The teachers and administrators were often referred to as "facilitators" rather than "directors." They provide guidance and encouragement, approve the project plans laid out by the students, make most of the decisions regarding funds, help make contacts within the community when necessary, and may offer ideas on how to improve the program. They also provide instruction and handle curriculum development to make service learning a more integral part of their schools' curricula. As one coordinator reported, "the adults stand behind the students, only making decisions and handling logistics that students are not . . . ready to perform."

Coordinators also noted that as students are given a stronger voice, they are more likely to take ownership of their projects and become even more involved. The greater their power is in a program, the more likely it is that they will feel they have a stake in its success, and they will begin to take the initiative in improving, expanding, and supporting its projects.

Conclusion

Service learning links service and learning in a reciprocal relationship. Thus, in effective service learning, each half reinforces the value of the other. We have seen this type of complementary relationship between students and their communities throughout Pennsylvania. Service learning efforts during the past year not only promoted the personal growth and academic achievement of students, but also used their talents to address real needs within the community.

Some definite themes emerged from the data collected during the 1995-96 evaluation year. One was that there are two distinct types of programs among the 101 subgrantees. One type mostly has integrated service learning, and the other has

primarily non-integrated community service. Each of these groups shows its own unique patterns within its projects and its general development. For the integrated programs, for instance, the majority of the projects are outgrowths of the existing curriculum, or to a lesser degree are cross-disciplinary themes. These programs also tended to have activities that were truly integrated throughout the school or district. For the non-integrated programs, on the other hand, most projects were initiated by school organizations or clubs, special events, or community service/service learning courses.

We also found that collaborations are essential to service learning. These partnerships can be difficult to initiate, but pay off in numerous benefits to the students, the programs, and the surrounding communities. Findings indicate that forming these relationships does become easier in time. This may be a result of connections formed through a previous partnership, by word of mouth, or by some other means; however, what is clear is that once one collaboration is in existence others have a tendency to fall into place with much less exertion on the part of program participants. These strong collaborations will eventually be instrumental in building self-sustaining programs, ultimately ensuring program longevity.

This mushrooming effect can be seen in the area of student participation as well. To quote an old cliché, "give 'em an inch, and they'll take a mile." When students are given a chance to have some input into a program's development, they will often lay claim to it and seek even greater involvement. With a little guidance and a lot of leeway, students will begin to run a program on their own. This doesn't happen overnight by any means; it is a process that starts with the administration making service learning a priority in schools. This, in turn, encourages teachers to become more involved, which then inspires students to participate. It is then their energy and imagination that give programs a special vitality. Thus it is with increased student voice that a program really begins to flourish.

The data shows, as well, that there is one common element that ties all of these themes together. It is primarily in older programs that we can expect to see higher levels of integration, greater numbers of and success in collaborations, and more student participation in the decision-making process. Younger programs may have these qualities as well, but experience more difficulty attaining and maintaining such elements of service learning.

From talking with students, we know that meaningful service brings "real life" to coursework and makes learning applicable to everyday experience. Students report that participating in service learning fosters in them a sense of pride and accomplishment. We also know from coordinators who track the attendance and behavior problems of participants that attendance on the day of service activities increases and discipline problems of some participants decrease. However, no empirical data has been collected in these areas. This clearly needs to be the next step in the evaluation process. Positive data pertaining to retention, GPA, attendance, and behavior problems will go far towards supporting service learning.

Appendix A

Year Two Objectives and Goals

Year Two Objectives and Progress

OBJECTIVE	GOAL	PROGRESS
Award Mini-Grants	55	82
Award Disseminator Grants	10	9*
Award Planning Grants	0	0
Number of Students Participating	22,500	51,437
Average Number of Hours of Service per Student per Year	35	35.52
Average Number of Hours of Reflection Activities per Student per Year	6	19.59
Cumulative Hours of Service Learning	945,000	1,592,652
Number of Teachers Actively Engaged	550	2,072
Number of Community Partners	250	1,843
Number of Teachers Trained	200	1,138**

* By funding one less disseminator grant 30 additional mini-grants and 10 program grants were able to be funded.

** Teachers were trained through out-services, IU trainings, state and national service learning conferences, and in-service at their individual schools or districts.

Progress of Subgrantees on Continuum of Service Learning***

LEVEL	PLANNED	PROGRESS
level 1 (clearinghouse/extracurricular)	5	19
level 2 (credit/mandated service)	10	6
level 3 (lab or course)	20	10
level 4 (instructional practice + 1 subject)	9	49
level 5 (school or district-wide focus)	6	17

*** This information is based on the data collected from the Individual Program Profiles. Each subgrantee was assigned a level based upon the majority of their projects. Since subgrantees were assessed within the profile on seven levels instead of five, the conversion goes as follows: Level 1 = 1&3, Level 2 = 2, Level 3 = 4, Level 4 = 5&6, Level 5 = 7.

Appendix B

Corporation for National Service Forms

CORPORATION
FOR NATIONAL
★ SERVICE

Learn and Serve America: K-12

BEGINNING OF YEAR INFORMATION FORM



Beginning of Year Information Form Instructions and Definitions

This form should be completed at the beginning of the grant cycle by an individual who operates a **Learn and Serve America: K-12 program** in a school or community-based organization. To determine if you are to complete this form, please review the definitions and examples below. If you have any questions, please call the organization from which you received your grant or the Office of Evaluation at the Corporation for National Service, (202) 606-5000 (ext. 488).

Example 1: COMMUNITY-BASED

A non-profit organization, Helping America!, receives a grant from the Corporation. Helping America! operates a program called Volunteers in Action through a local youth center.
The *Corporation grantee* is Helping America!
The *School District* line is left blank.
The *Community-Based Organization* is the local youth center.
The *Program* is Volunteers in Action.
Who completes this form? VOLUNTEERS IN ACTION.

Example 2: SCHOOL-BASED

A state education agency receives a grant directly from the Corporation. They award a subgrant to a school district who operates Volunteers in Action in three schools.
The *Corporation grantee* is the state education agency.
The *School District* and *School Name* lines are completed.
The *Program* is Volunteers in Action.
Who completes this form? THE VOLUNTEERS IN ACTION PROGRAM IN EACH OF THE THREE SCHOOLS.

SECTION I – Identification

Corporation Grantee—The organization that receives money directly from the Corporation. Generally, the grantee is also the legal applicant. State Education Agencies, grantmaking entities, State Commissions, Indian tribes, and US territories are usually the Corporation grantees.

Grantee ID Number—The 10 digit alphanumeric code assigned by the Corporation to each grantee. Please contact your Corporation grantee if you do not know their ID number.

School District Name—The name of the school district that sponsors the school-based service program (if applicable).

School Name or Community-Based Organization Name—The name of the school or community-based organization where the program is located (as applicable).

Program Name—The name of the service program (if applicable).

Congressional District—The congressional district in which the program is located.

SECTION II – Basic Program Profile

Program Profile—Please mark the ovals that apply or insert the appropriate numbers as indicated.

SECTION III – Primary Partners

Host Organizations—Those organizations for whom your participants provide service. Please identify the unit of each of your host-sites that directly coordinates your work. For example, a program providing services in a national park should identify the park with whom they work, not the Department of the Interior.

Funders—Those organizations or individuals who provide funds for the program. Please include cash contributions as well as the estimated value of in-kind contributions. On the first line, indicate the amount you receive from the Corporation (either directly or through a subgrant). When categorizing your contributors, report private individuals as "other."

SECTION IV – Primary Community Services

For each priority area that is a primary focus of your service activities, mark all the services you provide. Then complete part b by estimating the proportion of your total service time that is devoted to that priority. Your responses to the five part b questions (education, human needs, public safety, environment, and other) should sum to 100 percent of your service time.

SECTION V – Participants and Recipients

Please write numbers in the boxes and mark the appropriate ovals as indicated.

SECTION VI – Primary Beneficiaries

Please mark the appropriate ovals as indicated.

SECTION VII – Program Description

Please provide a three to four sentence description of your program and the services you provide.

USE NO. 2 PENCIL ONLY!

Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change.
Make solid marks that fill the oval completely.

Make no stray marks on this form.
Do not fold, tear, or mutilate this form.

WRONG MARKS:    

RIGHT MARK: 

SECTION I Identification

Corporation Grantee: _____

Grantee ID Number: _____

School District Name (if applicable): _____

School or Community-Based Organization Name (as applicable):

Program Name (if applicable): _____

Program Address:

Number and Street _____

City and State _____ ZIP Code _____

Telephone: () _____

Fax Number: () _____

Congressional District (please use the district number): _____

Program Dates of Operation (period of time when students are engaged in service learning activities):

From _____ To _____

This Form Was Completed By (please print): _____
Name Title/Position

Date Form Was Completed: _____
Month Day Year

SECTION II Basic Program Profile

1. What type of organization has primary responsibility for administering your program (mark one):

- ☐ Local Educational Agency (LEA)
- ☐ State Educational Agency (SEA)
- ☐ State Commission on National Service
- ☐ Indian Tribe/Tribal Government/U.S. Territory
- ☐ Community-based or non-profit organization
- ☐ Other (specify): _____

2. Is your program located in a(n):

- ☐ Primarily urban setting
- ☐ Primarily rural setting
- ☐ Primarily suburban setting
- ☐ Mixed (describe briefly): _____

3. Does your current service-learning program build upon previous activities or is it new?

- ☐ Builds on existing program
- ☐ New program

4. If your program is school-based, what is your school enrollment: _____ (number of students)

5. If your program is school-based, is the school:

- ☐ Public
- ☐ Private

6. When does your program operate?

- ☐ During the summer
- ☐ During some portion of the academic year (e.g., quarters, semesters, trimesters)
- ☐ During the entire academic year
- ☐ During the entire calendar year

7. In what context does your program operate?

- ☐ District wide
- ☐ School wide
- ☐ Grade wide
- ☐ Multiple grades (not school wide)
- ☐ Single class
- ☐ One content area within a single grade (e.g., 9th grade history)
- ☐ One content area within several grades (e.g., 7th and 8th grade health)
- ☐ Out of school youth
- ☐ Other (describe briefly): _____

SECTION III Primary Partners

Anticipated Host Organizations:

Print or type the full name and ZIP code of the primary host sites or sponsoring organizations for whom your participants provide service:

Organization Codes

- 1 = For-profit organization
- 2 = Community-based organization, Non-profit
- 3 = Federal Government
- 4 = State Government

- 5 = Local Government
- 6 = Educational institution/organization
- 7 = Foundation
- 8 = Religious organizations
- 9 = Other

Name	ZIP Code	Type of Organization (mark one)
Ex. Anytown Community Literacy Center	00000	1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9
1.		1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9
2.		1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9
3.		1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9
4.		1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9
5.		1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9
6.		1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9
7.		1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9
8.		1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9
9.		1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9
10.		1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9
11.		1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9

Funders:

Print or type the full name, ZIP code of your primary funders, and the amounts received beginning with the Corporation for National Service on line one.

FUNDING AMOUNTS

Name	ZIP Code	Cash	In-kind	Total	Type of Organization (mark one)
1. Corporation for National Service	00525				1 ☐ 2 ☒ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9
2.					1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9
3.					1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9
4.					1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9
5.					1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9
6.					1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9
7.					1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9
8.					1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9
9.					1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9
10.					1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9
11.					1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7 ☐ 8 ☐ 9

SECTION IV What are the primary community services that your students provide?

Note: Your responses to 1b, 2b, 3b, 4b, and 5b should sum to 100 percent.

1a. Education

(Include primary services only; mark all that apply.)

School Readiness

- Child care
- Head start/preschool
- Parent literacy
- Other (Specify: _____)

School Success

- In-class support
- After school tutoring
- After school mentoring
- Service-learning coordinator
- Other (Specify: _____)

b. About what percent of the LSA program's total service is devoted to Education:

%	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

4a. Environment

(Include primary services only; mark all that apply.)

Neighborhood Environment

- Revitalizing neighborhoods
- Eliminating environmental risks
- Energy efficiency efforts, recycling
- Other (Specify: _____)

Natural Environment

- Conserving and restoring public lands
- Trail maintenance
- Natural resource sampling, mapping, and monitoring
- Other (Specify: _____)

b. About what percent of the LSA program's total service is devoted to Environment:

%	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

2a. Human Needs

(Include primary services only; mark all that apply.)

Health

- Independent living assistance
- Supporting community health clinics
- Prenatal care
- Health care to families of young children
- Other (Specify: _____)

Home

- Shelter support for the homeless
- Rehabilitating low-income housing
- Public assistance transition support
- Other (Specify: _____)

b. About what percent of the LSA program's total service is devoted to Human Needs:

%	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

5a. Other

Other (Specify: _____)

b. About what percent of the LSA program's total service is devoted to other areas:

%	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

3a. Public Safety

(Include primary services only; mark all that apply.)

Crime Prevention

- Violence prevention patrols
- Conflict resolution/Community mediation
- Reduction of substance abuse
- After school activities
- Other (Specify: _____)

Crime Control

- Community policing
- Victim assistance
- Anti-victimization programs
- Juvenile justice programs
- Other (Specify: _____)

b. About what percent of the LSA program's total service is devoted to Public Safety:

%	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

SECTION V Participants and Recipients

Total Participants

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Participant Characteristics

Gender (number who are):

Male	Female
0	0
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6
7	7
8	8
9	9

FOOTNOTES

- Total Participants:** Total number of participants who enrolled in the program, including those who did not successfully complete it. Participants are generally the students or school-age youth who serve.
- Economically Disadvantaged Participants** are those:
 - who receive, or the members of a family who receive, cash welfare payments under a Federal, state, or local welfare program;
 - whose household income is below the poverty level or less than 70% of the Lower Living Standard (i.e., JTPA level); or
 - who receive food stamps pursuant to the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C.A. 2011 et seq.) or who qualify as homeless individuals under section 103 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11912-1).
- Educationally Disadvantaged:** Participants eligible for remedial education or other education assistance programs.
- Non-Participant Volunteers:** Individuals who, though not enrolled in a program as participants, perform service through the program. (Examples: Adult volunteers or students recruited by program participants to perform service activities.)
- Service Recipients:** Individuals who benefit from the community services provided by participants. Participants should not be included as service recipients.

Race/Ethnicity (number who are):

White (non-Hispanic)	African-American (non-Hispanic)	Hispanic/Latino	Asian/Pacific Islander	Native American/Alaskan Native	Multi-racial	Other
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9	9

Grade Level (number who are):

Kindergarten-3rd	4th-5th	6th	7th-8th	9th-12th	Out-of-School Youth	Number of Out-of-School Youth Who Are:
0	0	0	0	0	0	_____ 5-7 years old
1	1	1	1	1	1	_____ 8-10 years old
2	2	2	2	2	2	_____ 11-13 years old
3	3	3	3	3	3	_____ 14-16 years old
4	4	4	4	4	4	_____ 16+ years old
5	5	5	5	5	5	
6	6	6	6	6	6	
7	7	7	7	7	7	
8	8	8	8	8	8	
9	9	9	9	9	9	

Other Characteristics If Known (number who are):

Economically disadvantaged

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Educationally disadvantaged

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Projected Number of Total Non-Participant Volunteers

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Projected Number of Total Service Recipients (if known)³

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

SECTION VI

Who are the primary beneficiaries of the community services your students provide?
(Include primary beneficiaries only; mark all that apply.)

Primary Beneficiaries

- Pre-school children
- K-12 students
- College students
- Young adults (ages 17-24)
- Senior citizens
- General public
- Educationally disadvantaged
- Economically disadvantaged
- Mentally disabled persons
- Physically challenged persons
- Homeless
- Low-income housing residents
- Unemployed
- "At-Risk" youth
- Immigrants, refugees
- Migrant workers
- Patients/Residents in hospitals, nursing homes, hospices, other long-term care facilities
- Substance-dependent individuals
- Outdoor recreationists
- Environmentalists, conservationists
- Families/parents
- Business community
- Veterans
- Other (Specify):

SECTION VII: Program Description

This image shows a single page of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

THANK YOU!



Learn and Serve America: K-12 End of Year Information Form

CORPORATION
FOR NATIONAL
★ SERVICE

INSTRUCTIONS, DEFINITIONS, and FOOTNOTES

INSTRUCTIONS

This form should be completed at the end of the grant cycle by an individual who operates a Learn and Serve America: K-12 program in a school or community-based organization. To determine if you are required to complete this form, please review the definitions and examples below.

For two items, "Other Characteristics" and "Participant Status at the End of the Program" (parts a. and b.), please note that a given individual may fall into more than one category. For example, a participant may be educationally as well as economically disadvantaged. This participant should be included in both totals. Similarly, a participant may satisfactorily complete the program and receive academic credit.

If you have any questions, please call the organization from which you received your grant or the Office of Evaluation at the Corporation for National Service at 202-606-5000 (ext. 488).

Example 1: COMMUNITY-BASED

A non-profit organization, Helping America!, receives a grant from the Corporation. Helping America! operates a program called Volunteers in Action through a local youth center.

The Corporation Grantee is Helping America!.

The School District line is left blank.

The Community-Based Organization is the local youth center.

The program is Volunteers in Action.

Who completes this form? VOLUNTEERS IN ACTION

Example 2: SCHOOL-BASED

A state education agency receives a grant directly from the Corporation. They award a subgrant to a school district that operates Volunteers in Action in three schools.

The Corporation Grantee is the state education agency.

The School District and School lines are completed.

The Program is Volunteers in Action.

Who completes this form? THE VOLUNTEERS IN ACTION PROGRAMS IN EACH OF THE THREE SCHOOLS.

DEFINITIONS

Corporation Grantee—The organization that receives money directly from the Corporation. Generally, the grantee is also the legal applicant. State Education Agencies, grantmaking entities, State Commissions, Indian tribes, and US territories are usually the Corporation grantees.

Grantee ID Number—The 10 digit alphanumeric code assigned by the Corporation to each grantee. Please contact your Corporation grantee if you do not know their ID number.

School District Name—The name of the school district where the school-based service program is located (if applicable).

School Name or Community-Based Organization Name—The name of the school or community-based organization where the program is located (as applicable).

Program Name—The name of the service program (if applicable).

Program Dates of Operation—The program start and end dates (month/day/year).

This Form Was Completed By—Enter the name and title of the individual who filled out this form.

Date Form Completed—The date that this form was completed (month/day/year).

Telephone—The telephone number where the person who completed this form can be reached.

Fax Number—The fax number for the person who completed this form, if available.

SECTION 2

Participant Status at the End of the Program

Number who:

a. Satisfactorily completed the program:

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

b. Received academic credit:

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

c. Left the program early because they:

Returned to school
(out-of-school youth)

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Got a job

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Entered the military

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Were expelled/
suspended from school

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Quit for personal
reasons

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Were asked to leave
by program staff

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Other

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

(Note: a and the elements of c should add up to the number of "Total Participants" given in Section 1.)

Total Participant Hours of Direct Service

Total hours of
direct service

0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9

In education

0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9

In human needs

0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9

In environment

0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9

In public safety

0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9

In other service

0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9

Total Participant Hours of Service-Related Activities

Coursework

0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9

Reflection

0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9

Training

0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9

Other service-
related activities

0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9

Total Non-Participant Volunteer Hours

0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9

**THANK
YOU!**

SECTION 1

Participant Characteristics

Gender (number who are):

Total Participants

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Male

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Female

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Race/Ethnicity (number who are):

White (non-Hispanic)

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

African-American (non-Hispanic)

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Hispanic/Latino

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Asian/Pacific Islander

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Native American/Alaskan Native

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Multi-racial

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Other

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Grade Level (number who are):

Kindergarten-3rd

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

4th-5th

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

6th

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

7th-8th

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

9th-12th

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Out-of-School Youth

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Number of Out-of-School Youth Who Are:

_____ 5-7 years old

_____ 8-10 years old

_____ 11-13 years old

_____ 14-16 years old

_____ 16+ years old

Other Characteristics If Known (number who are):

Economically disadvantaged

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Educationally disadvantaged

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Total Non-Participant Volunteers

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

Total Service Recipients (if known)⁵

0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9

FOOTNOTES

1. **Total Participants:** Total number of participants who enrolled in the program, including those who did not successfully complete it. Participants are generally the students or school-age youth who provide service.
2. **Economically Disadvantaged Participants** are those:
 - a. who receive, or are members of a family which receives, cash welfare payments under a Federal, state, or local welfare program; or
 - b. whose household income is below the poverty level or less than 70% of the Lower Living Standard (i.e., JTPA eligible); or
 - c. who receive food stamps pursuant to the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C.A. 2011 et seq.); or
 - d. who qualify as homeless individuals under section 103 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C.A. 11302); or
 - e. who are foster children on behalf of whom state or local government payments are made; or
 - f. who are adult disabled individuals whose own income meets the requirements of clause (a) or (b) above, regardless of whether their family income meets such requirements.
3. **Educationally Disadvantaged:** Participants eligible for remedial education or other education assistance programs.
4. **Non-Participant Volunteers:** Individuals who, though not enrolled in a program as participants, perform service through the program. (Examples: Adult volunteers or students recruited by program participants to perform service activities.)
5. **Service Recipients:** Individuals who benefit from the community services provided by participants. Participants should not be included as service recipients.
6. **Direct Service:** Service activities provided to community beneficiaries (or beneficiary agencies) generally in the areas of education, human needs, environment, and public safety. Does not include "Service-Related Activities" described below.
7. **Other Service:** Community service activities in areas other than education, human needs, environment or public safety. Examples include special events and cleanup after natural disasters.
8. **Service-Related Activities:** Activities other than direct community service, including coursework, service reflection, training, etc.

USE NO. 2 PENCIL ONLY! Erase cleanly any changes or stray marks.

WRONG MARKS Z X O G

RIGHT MARK ●

Corporation Grantee: _____

Grantee ID Number: _____

School District Name (if applicable): _____

School Name or Community-Based
Organization Name (as applicable): _____

Program Name (if applicable): _____

Program Dates of Operation: _____
From _____ To _____

This Form Was Completed By (please print): _____
Name _____ Title/Position _____

Date Form Completed: _____
Month _____ Day _____ Year _____

Telephone: (_____) _____

Fax Number: (_____) _____

Appendix C

Site Visit Protocol and Program Profile



University of Pittsburgh

Pennsylvania Service Learning Evaluation Network

DATE: January 19, 1996
TO: Peer Consultants
FROM: Yolanda Yugar
PA Service Learning Evaluation Network
RE: Evaluation process

Happy New Year! This letter comes to you in lieu of the meeting we would have had on Friday, January 12 in Harrisburg to discuss site visit protocol and procedures.

Enclosed is a site visit assignment sheet and a number of forms that are a part of the evaluation process. Site visits are one of the responsibilities of the peer consultants. Each peer consultant has been assigned one site visit in their area. Please check your assignment. Site visitors are to schedule site visits with the contact person in late January. Visits typically take place from late February to early April. If your schedule does not permit you to do a site visit, please notify Yolanda Yugar at 412-648-1776 as soon as possible.

Enclosures:

1. Site Visit Assignment Sheet
2. Site Visit Protocol
3. Site Visit Checklist
4. Program Profile
5. Site Visit Forms:
 - a) Supervisor Evaluation
 - b) Advisory Board Questionnaire
 - c) Advisory Board Evaluation
 - d) Student Evaluation
 - e) Service Learning Assessment

Please review all forms carefully, especially the sheet on site visit protocol. This will help make your visit run smoothly. As soon as you have scheduled your site visit with the contact person, notify me of the date of the site visit. If you have any questions, please call me at the number given above.

SITE VISIT ASSIGNMENT SHEET

School District	Contact Person	Site Visitor
Abington	JoAnn Maguire	Jeff Singleton
Coatesville	Kathleen Hood	Yolanda Yugar
Conrad Weiser	Dr. Betsy Adams	Yolanda Yugar
Lancaster	Toby Greco	Yolanda Yugar
Strawberry Mansion	Marlene Brubaker	Rosaline Chivas
Scranton West Intermed.	Angie McDonough	Lou White
Upper Darby	Kathy Daly/Susan Rothamel	Beth Margolis-Rupp
William Penn	Eileen Stephey	Richard Subers/ Lou White
Southern Columbia Area	James Breslin	Lou White
Mount Union	Mark Crosson	Dale Baker
Midd-West	Don Goodwin	Yolanda Yugar
Juniata-Mifflin AVTS	Michael Smith	Yolanda Yugar
Bald Eagle	Mary Beth Crago	Dale Baker
Chestnut Ridge	Mark Clevenger	Landi Hoover
Franklin County Vo-Tech	Roberta DeProspero Johnston	Dale Baker
Blairsville-Saltsburg	Joe Emrick	Dale Baker
Highlands	Joan Mellon	Yolanda Yugar
Millcreek Township	Dr. Patricia Pollifrong	De De Baljo
Salisbury-Elk Lick	Francis Meyers	Yolanda Yugar
Smethport Area	Diane Smith	Yolanda Yugar
Washington	Cliff Goodrow	Dale Baker/Y.Yugar
Wilkinsburg	Patrick Gribbin	Annette Williams/ Y.Yugar

SITE VISIT PROTOCOL

Goals of the Site Visit

1. Assess the current level of implementation -- where schools and projects are on the continuum, the level of commitment, and what is working.
2. Assess the challenges and obstacles for service learning by teachers, administrators, school districts, agency, students, community leaders and organizations, and parents.
3. Assess service learning through the eyes of the grant coordinator, understand their challenges and obstacles, and suggest strategies to address these difficulties. In particular, assess the developmental issues that arise over time as service learning develops. This is where you can provide technical assistance.

Program Profile

The program profile will be mailed to all grantees by the PA Service Learning Evaluation Network late in January. New grantees - those receiving site visits - are to have their profiles completed prior to the visit. Enclosed is a copy of the profile the site will be completing.

Pre-site Visit Preparation

1. **Scheduling Site Visit.** Contact the coordinator and set a date for the site visit. A typical site visit is four to five hours long. First, plan to meet with the coordinator for about two hours to discuss the program in general and to review the program file. Also plan a short debriefing at the end of the visit with the coordinator to review the Service Learning Assessment Form. Request time with the supervisor (30 minutes), the advisory board when applicable (45 minutes), and 8 to 10 students in a small groups (30 minutes).

- * **Supervisor** -- gauge organizational support and interest.
- * **Advisory board** -- explore developmental issues, service activities, collaboration, and linkages.
- * **Students** -- focus on the value of service, both academic and personal.
- * **Program Activity** -- make arrangements to observe a program activity if possible.

There are forms to be completed by the site visitor for each of the interviews. Remind the coordinator that the profile is to be completed prior to the visit. If for some reason they have not received the profile, please contact me immediately.

2. Request a copy of the proposal to review from the Department of Education prior to your visit.

3. Ask the Coordinator to send or fax you a copy of the agenda for the site visit and any directions you may need one week before the scheduled visit. This will help both of you plan for the day.

Site Visit

1. Meet with the coordinator and establish a congenial relationship. Establish your credibility if needed, discuss the goals of the site visit and review the enclosed checklist. Show them the Service Learning Assessment Form so they know what will be assessed, and inform them that both of you will fill out the form at the end of the site visit. Finally, discuss the program profile.

2. Complete a form for each interview -- advisory board, supervisor, and student evaluation. On the evaluations, summarize the responses from the interviews.

* Each **advisory board** member also completes a brief questionnaire.

3. Complete the Service Learning Assessment Form with the coordinator at the end of the visit. Each category reflects the ASLER Standards and has a maximum score. The total score for the Assessment Form is 105 points. Throughout the site visit, it is important to take note of these areas so that you can appropriately score each category. Recommend that the organization make a copy of the Assessment Form.

Post-site Visit

X 1. Return the completed profile, all forms, and a brief summary of the site visit to the Service Learning Evaluation Network, 5D01 Forbes Quadrangle, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh PA 15260 for processing.

2. Send a thank you note to the coordinator for their help and cooperation.

SITE VISIT CHECKLIST - items to discuss with the coordinator

1. The site visitor's role is to provide a big picture of service learning programming to the PA. Department of Education and the National Corporation for Service.
2. Check that the programs are keeping track of data. It is crucial for grantees to develop a system which allows them to keep track of the number of participants, number of service hours, and number of learning hours (not only per participant, but also total) to include on various reports.
3. Fill out the Federal forms as soon as you receive them. Federal forms are important and need to be completed. They must be sent two weeks after you receive them to the PA Service Learning and Evaluation Network, 5D01 Forbes Quadrangle, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260 or faxed to 412-648-7198.
4. Complete a year-end report. Each site will receive the form for the final report at the mandatory meeting in April. There is a sample of the report in the November Update from the Department of Education. The report must be sent to Dale Baker at the Department of Education by June 1, 1996.
5. Remind people that articles and videos are important. Please direct them to Dale Baker, Bureau of Community and Student Services, 333 Market Street, Harrisburg, PA 17120.
6. All contract and financial questions are to be referred to Dale Baker at 717-783-9290.
7. All data collection questions are to be referred to Yolanda Yugar at 412-648-1776.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

The Pennsylvania Department of Education

Bureau of Community and Student Services

333 Market Street, Harrisburg, PA 17126-033

Telephone: 717-783-9290, Fax: 717-783-6617

1995-1996
Learn and Serve America K-12
Program Profile

Please type your responses



Prepared by: The Pennsylvania Service-Learning Evaluation Network

School of Education, University of Pittsburgh

5D21 Forbes Quadrangle, Pittsburgh, PA 15260

(412) 648-7196, Fax (412) 648-7198

The Pennsylvania Service Learning Evaluation Network

The Pennsylvania Service Learning Evaluation Network, based at the University of Pittsburgh, supports service learning programs. The network provides information, support, resources, and guidance. The primary goal of the network is to help schools evaluate their service learning programs.

For more information please contact Carl I. Fertman, Ph.D., director; the Pennsylvania Service Learning Evaluation Network, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, 5D21 Forbes Quadrangle, Pittsburgh, PA, 15260, (412) 648-7196, FAX (412) 648-7198 or Yolanda Yugar, M.Ed., project director; Pennsylvania Learn and Service America Grant Program Evaluation (412) 648-1776.

The Pennsylvania Service Learning Evaluation Network is funded by Pennsylvania Department of Education, Office of Community and Student Services; Dale Baker, coordinator; 333 Market Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120, Telephone 717-783-7089.

1995-1996 Learn and Serve America K-12 Program Profile

School District:

School:

Coordinator:

Coordinator's supervisor:

1. Organizational support and commitment are key for successful service learning. The chart below can help you determine the level of commitment and support in your school or district. The first grouping pertains to individuals active in service learning, the second grouping pertains to allocations for time, materials, and training; and the third grouping pertains to the inclusion of service learning as a meaningful teaching methodology.

Please tally all indicators present in your school or district.

How many of the following individuals are involved in service learning projects in your school or district?	Number
Teachers	
Administrators	
Students	
Parents	
Community Agency Staff	

Are allocations provided for:	YES	NO	NA
Materials			
Funding			
In-service Training			
Release time			

Does your school have:	YES	NO	NA
Mission Statement that includes service learning			
Teams			
Block Scheduling			
Service learning advisory board			

2. Please tally all service learning in-service training that has occurred during the school year thus far.

Service-Learning in-service training	Number
Grade-level	
School-wide	
District-wide	
Please list other service learning training:	

List any public relations information that has been developed during the year thus far.

Materials	Completed	In-progress	Topic (please specify)
Training materials			
Videos			
Posters			
Brochures			
Newsletters			
Curriculums			
Conference presentations, papers, etc.			

3. Schools and community agencies have faced many challenges when students participate in the decision-making process for program activities. Participation ranges from students having no role and adults making all decisions, to students having extensive involvement.

What is the level of student participation in the decision-making process for service learning program activities?	Please check
no participation	
little participation	
some participation	
a great deal of participation	

Please elaborate on your answer.

4. Collaborations between schools and community agencies develop in a number of different ways. Sometimes they are initiated by the community agency, but more often they are initiated by an interested teacher, student, or parent. Please discuss how collaborations with community agencies are initiated, supported, and strengthened in your school or district. If collaborations do not exist or are weak, please discuss the challenges that face collaboration and what could be done to eliminate them.

5. Service learning programs/projects exist at all levels of the continuum. Please list ALL service learning programs/projects, their level on the continuum, content area(s) when applicable, services provided, and any community agencies involved.

Type of Program or Project	School Club/ Organization	Extra Credit	Special Event	Community Service Class	Outgrowth of Existing Curriculum	Coordinating Disciplinary Themes	School Wide
Level	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Program/Project Name	Level	Content Area(s)	Services Provided	Community Agencies

Project Name	Level	Content Area(s)	Services Provided	Community Agencies

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE SITE VISITOR

Site _____ Evaluator _____ Date _____

Service Learning Site Visit: Supervisor Evaluation

Plan to spend 30 minutes with the coordinator's supervisor. The purpose of the interview is twofold. The first goal is to gain organizational support for service learning. For example, make sure the supervisor is aware of important dates, such as those for conferences. The second goal is to assess organizational support for service learning. Please record the supervisor's answers to the following five questions.

1. How is service learning progressing in your organization?
2. What aspects of service learning provide the greatest satisfaction or sense of accomplishment?

**TO BE COMPLETED BY EACH ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER
WHO MEETS WITH THE SITE VISITOR**

Site _____ Evaluator _____ Date _____

Advisory Board Questionnaire

Each Advisory Board is made up of members of many community organizations, institutions and groups. Please circle the number to the left of the community organization or group to which you belong (choose only one).

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| 1. Business Community | 2. Criminal Justice | 3. Religious Community |
| 4. Local Government | 5. Elementary / Secondary Schools | 6. Parent group (eg. Neighborhood Group, PTO) |
| 7. Youth Organization (YMCA, 4-H, Other) | 8. College, University, or Technical School | 9. Senior Citizens' group |
| 10. Human Service Agency that deals with alcohol and other drug abuse treatment and prevention | 11. Human Service Agency that deals with other issues | 12. General concerned citizen (non-affiliated youth or adults) |
| 13. Volunteer community organization (social or neighborhood) | 14. Health Professional | 15. Other _____ |

GENDER

1. Male 2. Female

AGE GROUP

- | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1. under 20 years | 5. 50 to 59 years |
| 2. 20 to 29 years | 6. 60 to 65 years |
| 3. 30 to 39 years | 7. over 65 years |
| 4. 40 to 49 years | |

RACE

- | | |
|---------------------|----------------|
| 1. Native American | 4. Hispanic |
| 2. Asian | 5. Caucasian |
| 3. African American | 6. Other _____ |

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE SITE VISITOR

Site _____ Evaluator _____ Date _____

Service-Learning Site Visit: Advisory Board Evaluation

Please discuss frankly the current status of your service-learning advisory board. Does it exist? Is it functional? What has worked; what hasn't? What issues are dealt with on a typical agenda?

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE SITE VISITOR

Site _____ Evaluator _____ Date _____

Service Learning Site Visit: Student Evaluation

In a group of 8 to 10 students, please discuss the following questions. Introduce yourself and the students. Tell the students you are interested in their opinions about service learning and need their help. Let them know you are going to take notes. Inform them that their comments will help strengthen service learning.

1. How has service learning helped/not helped you in with your class(es)?

2. Do you think service learning is important? Why?

TO BE COMPLETED BY SITE VISITOR WITH COORDINATOR AT END OF SITE VISIT

Service Learning Assessment

School District:		Date:	
Coordinator:			
Evaluator:			
Standard	ASLER	SCORE	MAX
A. Service Learning Integration Linkages between service and learning, preparation and reflection components, efforts are recognized, efforts are continually evaluated, and skilled guidance and supervision. <u>If only service is occurring, the maximum points that can be given in this category are 13.</u> 1. Service : 2. Learning :	I, III, IV, VII, X		25
B. Organization Commitment Role of service-learning in school reform, support from administration (e.g. financial, time, etc.).	IX		10
C. Parents Number of parents involved in service learning and their type of commitment.	X		5
D. Collaborations and Linkages Number of organizations involved; Examples of supportive groups, nature of support, benefits of support; future plans.	VIII		10
E. Service Impacts on: Participants, beneficiaries, communities, school, agency or CBO.	II, VI		10
F. Advisory Board Number of members; diversity of membership; tasks, responsibilities and future plans.	X		5
G. Youth Voice Involvement beyond service learning activities (e.g. in administration, evaluation, advisory committees, and communications).	IV, V		10
H. Coordinator Role Coordinator role and duties	X		10
I. Information/Communication Network Development of formal and informal information/communication networks, including district personnel, parents, and community members.	X		10
J. Resources Use of materials and support. Product development and dissemination.	XIII, IX		10



University of Pittsburgh

Pennsylvania Service Learning Evaluation Network

To: First Year Pennsylvania Learn and Serve America Grantees

From: Yolanda Yugar
PA Service Learning Evaluation Network

Date: January 17, 1996

RE: Evaluation: Program Profile and Site Visit

Happy New Year! In the November Learn and Serve America's Coordinator Update, the Program Profile and the Site Visit were listed as one of the evaluation requirements for new grantees. You may recall that a sample profile was included in the Update so that you would know what to expect.

Enclosed please find a booklet of profile questions that must be completed in time for your site visit. You will be pleased to know that we have drastically shortened the profile from previous years in the continuing attempt to reduce the paper load while still gathering pertinent data.

Please answer all the profile questions in the booklet and make a copy of the completed profile for your records. Since the profile is short, we are not offering it on computer diskette; however, if you would like to do the profile on your computer, please enter the questions along with your answers. If you have used the sample profile as a guideline in collecting data, the profile should take you about a hour to complete. Make sure you have a hard copy ready for your site visitor. Our goal is to get an accurate picture of what is happening in each program. The profile is also an excellent way for you to track the growth and strength of your program.

The site visits are planned for late February, March, and early April. You will be telephoned by your site visitor during the next few weeks to set up a day to visit. The visit will last four to five hours.

The major focus of the visit is to discuss the completed profile. Reviewing the profile takes about two hours. Site visitors are also required to meet with the your supervisor (30 minutes), advisory committee (45 minutes), and a group of 8 to10 students (30 minutes). We are interested in gauging organizational support and interest from your supervisor. We will explore developmental issues, service activities, collaboration, and linkages with the advisory board. Time spent with students will focus on the value of service, both academic and personal. If possible, we would also like to observe a service learning activity.

Please call me at 412-648-1776 if you have any questions. Thanks for your help and cooperation. We look forward to your site visit.



University of Pittsburgh

Pennsylvania Service Learning Evaluation Network

To: Pennsylvania Learn and Serve America Grantees
From: Yolanda Yugar
PA Service Learning Evaluation Network
Date: January 17, 1995
RE: Evaluation: Program Profile

Happy New Year! It is time once again for the Program Profile. You will be happy to know that we have drastically shortened the profile from previous years, in a continuing attempt to reduce the paper load while still gathering pertinent data.

Please answer all of the profile questions in the booklet and make a copy of the completed profile for your records. Our goal is to get an accurate picture of what is happening in each program. The profile is also an excellent way for you to track the growth and strength of your program.

Since the profile is short, we are not offering it on computer diskette; however, if you would like to do the profile on your computer, please enter the questions along with your answers and return a hard copy to the PA Service Learning Evaluation Network. Profiles are due to the PA Service Learning Evaluation Network, 5D01 Forbes Quad, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260, by April 30th. Enclosed is a return envelope for your convenience.

Please call me at 412-648-1776 if you have any questions. Thanks for your help and cooperation.

Appendix D

Service Learning Hours by Subgrantee

Total SL

25-Jun-96

School

School	Total Service Hours	Total Learning Hours	Total Service Learning Hours	Average SL Per Participant
Abington School District	6735	130	6865	5.1
Altoona Area School District	28252	1580	29761	210.73
Antietam School District	3162	738	3900	9.4
Bald Eagle Area School District	2000	420	2420	50.5
Benton Area School District	1020	362	1382	6.75
Bethlehem Area School District	33065	7796	40861	12.2
Blairsville-Saltsburg School District	1225	0	1225	2
Bristol Township School District	2413	3800	5893	5.9
Carbon County Area Vo-tech	950	360	1310	14.4
Central Bucks School District-East&West	22	52	74	0.35
Central Bucks School District-Holicong/Lenape	4028	8830	12858	14
Central Bucks School District-Tamanend	70	68	138	0.22
Central Susquehanna U-Building Trails Program	90	285	375	18.75
Central Susquehanna U-Lead Detection Program	8890	691	9581	27.8
Chestnut Ridge School District	19425	19425	38850	63.8
Coatesville Area School District	54	140	194	0.49
Columbia Borough School District - LCA	2220	664	2884	96
Conrad-Weiser School District	6315	1237	7552	28.7
Corry Area School District	18000	13000	31000	20.5
Council Rock School District	10400	6350	16750	3.5
Derry Area School District	847	711	1558	38.2
Downingtown Area School District-(2)	1400	1400	2800	10
East Lycoming School District				
East Pennsboro Area School District	4401	1530	5931	55.9
Elizabeth Forward School District	8316	4258	12574	30.3
Erie School District	12000	12000	24000	61.6
Erie School District-Central	1500	41400	42900	373
Franklin County Area Vo-tech	2100	1100	3200	24.3
Green County Area Vo-tech	7343	600	7943	39.9
Greensburg Salem School District	957	493	1450	69.04
Highlands School District	400	0	400	0.5
Holidaysburg Area School District	33000	4280	37280	52.5
Homer-Center School District	4596	269	4865	24.1
Juniata-Mifflin County Area Vo-tech	500	390	890	25.3
Keystone Oaks School District	27603	19279	46882	41.8
Kutztown Area School District	6400	530	6930	19.1
Lake-Lehman School District	400	739	1139	5.9
Lancaster School District-Buehrle Alternative	5160	425	5585	242.8
Lincoln IU-Franklin Learning Center	82	341	423	13.1
Lower Merion Area School District	4000	1650	5650	3.7
Midd-West School District	685	1452	2137	16.1
Millcreek Township School District	22050	24000	46050	9.2
Monaca School District	218	13	31	3.71
Montrose Area School District	30923	880	31803	581
Moshannon Valley School District	2500	19460	21960	205.3
Mount Lebanon School District	7380	1120	8500	9.9
Mount Union Area School District	225	40	265	2.32
Nazareth Area School District	5880	2058	7938	27
North East School District	3780	4200	7980	61.1
Penn Manor School District	3293	4051	7344	30.3
Philadelphia School District Penn-Bartram	23960	7606	31566	187.87
Philadelphia School District-Bartram	4600	875	5475	20
Philadelphia School District-Central	76500	0	76500	40.05
Philadelphia School District-Crossan	4321	5984	16289	33.9
Philadelphia School District-Day	62	404	464	1.01
Philadelphia School District-Furness	8423	2122	10545	62.5

School	Total Service Hours	Total Learning Hours	Total Service Learning Hours	Average SL Per Participant
Philadelphia School District-Gillespie	22720	2655	25375	36
Philadelphia School District-Kensington	2430	2100	4530	88.7
Philadelphia School District-Lincoln	96000	500	96600	529.7
Philadelphia School District-Pickett	140	280	420	2.28
Philadelphia School District-Regional	540	439	979	54.4
Philadelphia School District-School Aged Parents	2000	3300	5300	204
Philadelphia School District-Strawberry Mansion	3050	2100	5150	27
Philadelphia School District-Taggart	64	43	107	1.48
Philadelphia School District-University City	252	80	332	8.3
Philadelphia School District-Wanamaker	48900	1050	49959	163.4
Philadelphia School District-West Philadelphia	6672	900	7572	25.76
Phoenixville Area School District	3165	300	3465	13.8
Pine Grove School Area District	220	101	321	29
Pittsburgh Public Schools-Carmalt	512	843	1355	4.8
Pittsburgh Public Schools-Carrick	16730	2110	18840	29.9
Pittsburgh Public Schools-McKelvey	50	37	87	0.29
Pottstown School District	960	480	1440	16.9
Quaker Valley School District	1240	260	1500	5.2
Radnor Township School District	3303	1621	4924	13.4
Riverview IU-Clarion Area School District	242570	232226	474796	225
Salisbury-Elk Lick School District	641	261	902	2.85
Schuylkill Haven Area School District	3681	275	3956	13.8
Scranton School District-E Scranton Intermediate	4800	4116	8916	44.6
Scranton School District-W Scranton Intermediate	403	546	949	15.3
Slippery Rock Area School District	13687	1628	15315	140.6
Smethport Area School District	655	900	1555	11.51
SOLANCO School District	80	8	88	0.28
Souderton Area School District	30	30	60	0.8
South Allegheny School District	2000	150	2150	7.81
Southeastern Greene School District-Mapletown	2280	845	3125	21.1
Southern Columbia Area School District	1000	230	1230	6.1
Southern Tioga School District	12293	1954	14247	77
State College Area School District	47749	6125	53874	45.9
Steel Valley School District	10926	389	11315	5.2
Tamaqua Area School District	100	674	774	10.9
Towanda Area School District	11000	5540	16540	31.6
Upper Darby School District	5150	4326	9476	92
Upper Merion Area School District	3300	0	3300	2.7
Washington School District	6512	495	7007	4.3
Wattsburg Area School District	2927	2500	5427	10.23
Wilkes-Barre Area School District	4396	11972	16368	76.8
Wilkinsburg School District	382	250	642	5.9
William Penn School District	787	950	1637	8.8
Woodland Hills School District	1150	8477	9627	326.58